



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the existence of the word, although Du Cange quotes *consanguinitare* from a glossary, where it is defined as signifying *sanguini* [for sanguine?] *propinquitare*. **Consanguinare* should give, according to phonetic laws, *consangnar*, later *consangrar*. The loss of the second *n* in our text may conceivably be due to dissimilation, or to the influence of *consagrar* < *consacrare*. I would call attention, however, to the carelessness with which the letters *m* and *n* (very often represented only by a nasal dash over the preceding vowel) are used in the unique manuscript of the *Poema del Çid*. The following examples, taken from Menéndez Pidal's edition, will illustrate this point:¹² *etro* for *entro* (47), *Marti* for *Martin* (141 ‡), *pagava* for *pagavan* (186 ‡), *mebrados* for *membrados* (315 ‡), *etrrar* for *entrar* (665 ‡), *destellado* for *destellando* (762), *laças* for *lanças* (834 ‡), *deseparaua* for *desemparaua* (910 ‡), *ded* for *dend* (1063 ‡, 2134), *dozitos* for *dozientos* (1164), *ale* for *alen* (1896), *era* for *eran* (2267 ‡), *capo* for *campo* (2343), *tatas* for *tantas* (2400 ‡), *ebayr* for *embayr* (3011), *ondrasse* for *ondrassen* (3155 ‡), *relumbra* for *relumbran* (3177 ‡), *lipios* for *limpios* (3354), *veçido* for *vençido* (3484 ‡). The omission of the nasal dash before a consonant being common in the codex, I suggest that we should restore **consangrar* in both the passages quoted above. Accepting this form, we may quite readily explain it as a Romance development (*con*+*sangre*+*ar*), and the existence of a Latin **consanguinare*, though of course still quite possible, may be doubted.

CARL C. RICE.

University of Oregon.

ISIDOR 17, 7.

IN the OHG. Isidor translation the passage *ipsa pluralitas personarum* is rendered *dhiu selba maneghiu chinomidiu* (Hench, *Q. and F.* 72, 17, 7; Braune, *ahd. Lesebuch*, 13, 44). Conjectures as to the correct reading have been made by Sievers, Weinhold, Hench and Kögel as follows:

dhiu selba maneghiu chinomideo (Kögel, Hench); *dhiu selba maneghiu chinomidn* (Weinhold, Sievers). In view of the fact that

¹² The ‡ indicates that the missing nasal dash was inserted later by a corrector.

a few lines above we find as a translation of *per pluralitatem personarum* the OHG. *dthurah dhero heideo maneghin*, I would suggest the emendation *dhiu selba maneghin chinomideo*.

None of these three readings are free from objections. Hench (*Q. and F.* 72, 95) regards *maneghiu* as an abstract feminine, nom. sing., and *chinomidiu* as a copyist's mistake for the gen. plural *chinomideo*, and refers to examples of feminine abstracts in *-iu* given by Kögel. We find, however, only five such nouns in *-iu*, *-u* and four in *-o*, and these are all in isolated monuments. Sievers further points out (P. B. B. 5, 144) that against seventeen abstract fem. in *in* occurring in thirty-one passages in Isidor any nominative in *-iu* is out of the question, and that *-in* must be regarded as the sole form of the abstract fem. nom. with Isidor.

On the other hand, Sievers's suggestion that *maneghiu* be treated as a strong inflected adjective after *dhiu* and that *chinomidiu* be regarded as a mistake for *chinomidn*, fem. abstract, is commented upon by Hench (*Q. and F.* 72, 95) as follows:

"*maneghiu* als st. Nom. eines adjectivums nach *dhiu selba*, wie Weinhold, Is. 8, 120, Sievers, Beitr. v. 144 f., es auffasst, wäre doch eine höchst seltene ausnahme in der Prosaliteratur des achten und neunten Jahrhunderts."

It necessitates, moreover, a translation that departs farther from the Latin than is usual with Isidor.

To the reading, *dhiu selba maneghin chinomideo*, there is the objection that we must assume two mistakes on the part of the scribe occurring in two successive words; but this emendation is the most acceptable as regards the Latin original, and the grammatical difficulties which the other readings present seem to disappear. Hench in his introduction (p. xviii) has shown that the Paris Codex is a copy. If the original had the reading *maneghn*, we can understand how a copyist might write *maneghiu*; and after this form in *in* the mistake of writing *chinomidiu* for *chinomideo*, as suggested by Hench, would easily follow.

CLARENCE WILLIS EASTMAN.

University of Iowa.

¹ Cf. *dhea dhrifaldin heilacnissa*, Ms. for *trinam sanctificationem*.